



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## Synopses of Important Articles.

THE CHIEF LAMA OF HIMIS ON THE ALLEGED "UNKNOWN LIFE OF CHRIST." By J. Archibald Douglas, with a postscript by MAX MÜLLER. *Nineteenth Century*, April 1896.

I was a resident in Madras during last year, but removed to the Northwest Provinces in the early part of the present year, and traveled the route of M. Notovitch, and spent considerable time as a guest at the Himis Monastery, into which M. Notovitch with such difficulty gained entrance, and where he alleged he was received by my host, the Chief Lama (or Abbot). My opinion on the general accuracy of M. Notovitch was held in abeyance, although the remarkable stories of his adventures with wild beasts seemed improbable in a region where good authorities claim them to have been impossible.

It is probable that M. Notovitch was at the hospital, where he was treated, not for a broken leg, but for toothache.

The following statements in M. Notovitch's book are contradicted by the Chief Superior of Himis Monastery, and sealed with his official seal. It should be added that this venerable man, who is held in esteem by both Buddhists and Europeans, was indignant at the travesties of his character by M. Notovitch, and wished to know if there were not some means of punishing him for such untruth. His denials were made to definite questions, and are as follows: No European ever was in the monastery with a broken leg. There is no such book as a Life of Issa in the monastery; nor, although for forty-two years a Lama, do I know of any book or manuscript that mentions the name of Issa; nor do I know any Lama who knows of such a book. I know nothing of the Egyptians, Assyrians, Israelites, and never talked with any gentleman about them. I know of no Buddhist writings in the Pâli language. [Evidently the Lama did not know the meaning of "Pâli."] I never received the presents alleged by M. Notovitch to have been given me by himself. The Buddhists know nothing of the name of Issa, and none of the Lamas ever heard it except through missionaries and European sources.

These denials were confirmed by inquiries put to the monks, and denials were obtained from the other Lamas mentioned by M. Notovitch. Evidently the work of M. Notovitch is a fiction, and an attempt to pervert Christianity.

To this article Max Müller adds a postscript, in which he apologizes for his suggestion that M. Notovitch may have been hoaxed by Buddhist monks. That gentleman, he declares, was not hoaxed, but he tried to hoax us.

And so another lie is nailed after having passed through eleven editions in French.

S. M.

THE PECULIARITY, ORIGIN AND REVEALED CHARACTER OF JESUS' TEACHING. By PROFESSOR WILLIBALD BEYSCHLAG, D.D., in his recently translated work *New Testament Theology*, Vol. I., pp. 31-38.

The universally pictorial style of Jesus' doctrine is conditioned not merely by a necessity of teaching, but rather springs chiefly from the nature of the things to be communicated. These are just the eternal truths, the heavenly things in earthly speech, which can only be brought home to the popular understanding by pictorial forms. It is, therefore, the mother speech of religion which Jesus uses. And he uses the speech with a purity and perfection that make his mode of communication quite incomparable. He rarely has recourse to argument or means of proof, because what he says is self-evident to the reason and conscience of the sincere man. His word is, therefore, in the highest sense testimony, viz., testimony to the divine which lives and moves in him. "Verily, I say unto you," is the constant expression of an inward certainty which can count on the willing or unwilling inward assent of his hearers. He does not even in any formal way teach the religion which lives in him. Its moral deductions are taught as in the Sermon on the Mount, or its conditions and ways of operation as in the parables. The thing itself he merely expresses, nay, still more presupposes than expresses. Three characteristic features distinguish the religion of Jesus from, and raise it above, all that it otherwise called religion in the world. (1) The religion of Jesus is a religion for the world, for universal man. It has no national limitations, it makes all men neighbors, and makes no distinction between them before God. It is further, a religion of the spirit, a religion of inwardness and freedom. It does not bind to sacred places and times, it knows no sacrifices or ceremonies, no forms or formulæ as in themselves pleasing to God. Nothing is of value in it but the pure heart, the love of God, and what that love calls forth in the heart of man. And yet it is capable of the most vigorous outward expression. (2) It is the perfectly moral and morally perfect religion. Everything in it has its ethical side, its moral fruits, without which it is of no value in the sight of God; while over and above every outward and particular deed of obedience, it claims the whole inward man for God and his commandments. From the same idea of God as the absolutely Good One, out of which springs the absolute demand, "Be ye perfect, even as the Father in heaven is perfect," arises, at the same time, the glad message of his unlimited fatherly mercy which goes in search of the lost son and meets him with forgiveness. (3) The gospel of Jesus is the religion of eternal life. It restores man to his lost eternal home, makes him at home as no other faith can in the invisible world of perfection which his soul craves, and thereby lifts him above the imperfections of his earthly existence. It consecrates this earth as a vestibule of heaven, and its sufferings as a school of eternal life.

If this is the peculiarity of the religious teaching of Jesus, there can hardly be any reasonable doubt about its origin. It bears throughout the

impress of the highest originality, of originating immediately in his own inner life; but it does so, not in the sense of being the outcome of his subjective fancy—in that case it would be the most insoluble of psychological and historical riddles—but as an immediate gift to his soul from above, a revelation of God in him and through him. That at least is the consciousness which he himself had of his doctrine (Matt. 11:27; John 7:16). In point of fact it is impossible, often as the attempt has been made, to deduce the consciousness of Jesus and the contents of his teaching from any spiritual power which existed in his day. Even the Jewish religion in which he was born and trained is no key to his own. There is no need for wasting words in seeking to prove the depth of the contrast which existed between Jesus and Pharisaism, a contrast which excludes any original affinity or sympathy. Nor is there any affinity of spirit between Jesus and the other well-known types of current Judaism, namely Sadduceism and Essenism. There is just as little trace of Alexandrianism in him.

This brings us to the real mystery of the personality of Jesus which forms the salient point of his whole teaching, and which explains and confirms on all sides its peculiarities as described above. He was conscious of being in a unique sense the Son of God, and out of this grew his consciousness of being the Saviour, and his sense of a vocation to help his brethren to a similar communion with God. It is impossible to resolve all that enduring ground-consciousness of his into a fanatical dream, it must be firmly founded on the truth, on a fact which not merely lets him have a revelation, but makes himself a personal revelation of God. The character of his teaching directly furnishes a twofold proof of the truth of that self-consciousness. (1) As compared with the Old Testament prophets, upon whom the divine inspiration came in specially elevated moments, as a power half foreign, Jesus knows no difference between hours of inspiration and ordinary hours. The spring of divine revelation wells up in him quietly and constantly, not while he is exalted above himself, but while simply himself and giving himself. It is the eternal foundation of his personal life from which his words of eternal life at all times flow. (2) He is not merely, like Moses, the prophet of his religion; he himself is its living content and basis, as his person supports, guarantees, indeed first makes possible his entire teaching. If communion with God, "the kingdom of God," had not been personally realized in him, his whole proclamation of it would have been destitute both of truth and meaning. Then we comprehend how all the great characteristics of his teaching, emphasized above, are nothing else than the natural manifestations of his personal consciousness, the simple issues of the fact of his unique and ideally perfect relation to God. Because he has the pure heart of the perfect child of God, he is able to see the Father in heaven as no prophet before him and no apostle after him; he throws upon the whole earthly life the transfiguring light of eternity.

THE BIBLE AND THE CHILD. THE HIGHER CRITICISM AND THE TEACHING OF THE YOUNG. By DEAN F. W. FARRAR, D.D., in *The Outlook*, March 21, 1896, pp. 508-510.

The question as to the right way of presenting the Bible to the young in the light of the higher criticism is a real and important one. There are three widely divergent ways, each equally dangerous to the faith of the rising generation: (1) By denouncing the new views of the Bible. Parents and teachers may go on inculcating dogmas about the Bible and methods of dealing with it which have long since become impossible to those who have really tried to follow the manifold discoveries of modern inquiry with perfectly open and unbiased minds. There are a certain number of persons who, when their minds have become stereotyped in foregone conclusions, are simply incapable of grasping new truths. They become obstructives, and not infrequently bigoted and furious obstructives. They have made themselves incapable of fair and rational examination of the truths which they impugn. They think that they can, by mere assertion, overthrow results arrived at by the life-long research of the ablest scholars, while they have not given a day's serious or impartial study to them. But a study of the past shows us that it has been one of the chief duties of each age in succession to cast off the slough of old ignorance. The advance of knowledge is a direct work of God's revealing power. This is certain, that if children are still taught to regard as articles of their religious belief opinions about the inerrancy, universal equal sacredness, verbal dictation, or supernatural infallibility of all that is contained between the covers of the sixty-six books which we call the Bible, the faith of those children, if they develop any intelligent capacity or openness of mind hereafter, is destined to undergo a rude and wholly needless shock, in which it will be fortunate if much of their religion does not go by the board. (2) By misrepresenting the new views of the Bible. Ignorant and incompetent controversialists talk as if the higher criticism had robbed the Bible of all value, and had shown it to be a mass of falsity and imposture. It requires some knowledge of language, of literature, of history, of national idiosyncracies, to be even capable of estimating the real nature of a result arrived at. Ignorant and irreverent attempts to discredit and vilify the Bible are even more egregiously illiterate than the idle super-exaltation which would turn it into a fetish. (3) By silently ignoring the new views of the Bible. This however, is not so easy, and at the best it is but the ostrich policy which tries to bury its head in the sand in order to escape its pursuers. If children are left unaware that the views of those most competent to represent their generation are widely different from those which were all but universal in the days of their grandfathers, the discovery will certainly come to them later on, and may come so suddenly as to imperil their faith.

Parents and teachers should speak without any subterfuge and with per-

fect plainness. We should be profoundly and unswervingly *truthful*. We ought never to practice that *falsitas dispersatura*, that "economy of truth," which has often been an avowed principle of action in the Church of Rome. Truth is too sacred a thing to admit of manipulations or juggling. Traditionalism, or professionalism, or self-interest should never for a moment be suffered to obscure our sense of its eternal obligation. We are not bound to teach children all we know, but we are most solemnly bound not to teach them anything which we feel to be doubtful as though it were certain, and still more are we bound not to teach them anything of which we ourselves begin to suspect the reality. And further, into a vast part of our teaching, by far the largest and most important part of it, no question of the higher criticism enters at all. The object of the best and most sacred Bible teaching is to form the character, not to store the intellect. It is moral, it is spiritual; it has to do with things eternal; it far transcends all minor questions of the date or historicity of the books in which it is enshrined.

More attention should be given the subject here discussed. The fact of the matter is, the young are those to whom the better view of the Bible which this century has worked out appeals most strongly. To those in middle life who have become fixed in traditional ideas of the Bible the modifications of view are quite apt to seem unnecessary and undesirable. It is to the younger men and women in our colleges and homes, who have gained nineteenth century views of history, literature, philosophy, the natural and social sciences, that the better view of the Bible comes as an emancipation. The traditional bottles are too small and fragile to hold the greater knowledge and thought of the present century. And to all who feel the unscientific nature, the incongruity, and unsatisfactoriness of certain features of the traditional view of the Bible, the better view should be given as quickly and as fully as possible. More than that, we make a great mistake if we imagine that the thinking boy or girl of ten years old cannot understand and appreciate the essential elements in the modified view of the Bible which has been worked out during the last two generations. Why is it that people welcome progress in everything but religion, while there they demand stagnation?

C. W. V.